

No. 11 NOVEMBER 1930

INTERNATIONAL STAR BULLETIN

CONTENTS

POEM	Krishnamurti	2
THE CESSATION OF FEAR		
A Talk by Krishnamurti		3
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS		6
SPIRITUAL REALISATION		
A Talk by Krishnamurti		19
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS		22
ITINERARY OF EUROPEAN TOUR		30

EDITORS:

LADY EMILY LUTTYENS AND D. RAJAGOPAL, M. A., LL. B. (Cantab.)

ADDRESS SUBSCRIPTIONS TO: INTERNATIONAL STAR BULLETIN, EERDE, OMMEN

SUBSCRIPTION: FOUR SHILLINGS, OR TWO GULDERS FIFTY CENTS, OR ONE DOLLAR, NET, FOR ONE YEAR PERIOD. RECEIPTS ARE NOT SENT UNLESS SPECIALLY REQUESTED. :: COPIES ARE DESPATCHED AT SUBSCRIBER'S RISK.

MANUSCRIPTS CANNOT BE RETURNED UNLESS ACCCOMPANIED BY ADDRESSED ENVELOPE AND SUFFICIENT INTERNATIONAL REPLY COUPONS

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PUBLISHED BY THE STAR PUBLISHING TRUST, AT EERDE, OMMEN, HOLLAND
PRINTED IN HOLLAND BY FIRMA H. TULP, ZWOLLE

*The mountain comes down to the dancing waters
But its head is hidden in a dark cloud.*

*On the stump of a dead pine
There grew a delicate flower.*

*The substance of my love is Life
And in its pathway there is no death.*

Krishnamurti

THE CESSATION OF FEAR

A TALK BY KRISHNAMURTI

Wednesday, 23 July, Summer Gathering.

If there is no contact with life, in the shape of action which involves choice and continual discernment, there is no possibility of full self-realisation. Such realisation can only come through the continual wearing down of individuality. But if action is born out of fear, that action is struggling to mould itself after a set type. Fear is caused fundamentally by looking for realisation or understanding outside yourself, by looking for some superhuman Being to save you from this darkness which surrounds you in your action. When there is fear, you are all the time trying to become; becoming is but imitation caused by fear. Whenever action springs from fear, that action instead of liberating is entangling you still further. True action is continual elimination, the wearing down of the self-consciousness which knows separation. But if action springs from fear, through that fear comes the formation of sects, of narrow groups of individuals who cling together in their becoming.

A sect, as a body, cannot approach truth, because truth is an individual realisation, an inward, individual effort. By clinging to a body you cannot arrive at the full realisation of being. That is why I insist that through the individual alone lies the possibility of full realisation. A sect or a group comes into being when there are many who are trying to imitate a type—not the complete truth, but a segment of the truth. In becoming, fear is involved, and the yielding to fear but increases fear, and hence delusion multiplies. Out of this becoming, based on fear, there is always the desire for having, for taking, the desire to be guided. So a narrow body is formed in pursuit of truth; but truth is never arrived at by groups or societies. Truth is perceived by individual effort alone.

Truth is unawareness of self-conscious existence. If you are but imitating, trying to become a type, following a set formula, you are

but yielding to fear; and so fear is multiplied. A man who would have no fear must realise that though forms of individual existence vary, though the expressions of self-consciousness change, though life manifests itself in different ways, fundamentally life is one. When you realise this, all fear ceases. Then there is no longer an attempt to become, but only an attempt to be. Through this striving there is an intuitive realisation of the unity of being, which at moments of extreme, highly-awakened reason (which is intuition) everyone feels and knows within himself. The task of individual self-conscious existence is to realise the full potentiality of this fact; and when it is realised fully, then individuality merges in the whole and has arrived at its fulfilment.

The cessation of fear is the beginning of being; and being is harmony, perfect balance in all its expressions. Being does not demand imitation, the formation of a group or a sect, the coming together of an army under leadership in the world of chaos. Being is inclusiveness, in which there is no awareness of "you" and "I". When you are aware of "you" and "I", there is disharmony, due to an effort at becoming in which fear is involved. Separation is caused by that ego or "I-ness", which is but the self-conscious existence of the individual; and from this separation of self-conscious individuality there is craving and illusion. Individuality is not an end in itself. Individuality is imperfection; it is in the process of becoming until it arrives at being.

Becoming is effort, being is the cessation of effort. Whenever there is effort, it is self-conscious and so imperfect. Being is but the pure awareness of effortless existence. These are words which you must translate in terms of intuition, which is reason in its highest form. To arrive at this being, you must look to the desire caused by self-conscious existence. When you understand desire, whence it springs and whither it is going, desire becomes a precious jewel to which you cling, which you are continually chiselling and refining. Such desire is the source of true discipline—not set discipline, but discipline that varies progressively until you arrive at pure being.

Desire is seeking unimpeded happiness. In search of happiness it

first seeks possessions, in which is involved greed, envy and so on. Then it goes to the next stage, the enjoyment of subtle things. Before you arrive at that subtle enjoyment, there must be control—with the understanding of the purpose of individual existence—of physical desires, of gross enjoyment. Most people arrive at this control of physical enjoyment late in life, when they are old, after they have experienced it without understanding. Through sheer fatigue, through lack of energy, there is naturally control, unconscious control which is not the control of understanding.

A man who would be free of delusion and craving must have perfect control of the body—control through understanding, not through suppression or repression. Control comes with the desire for the understanding of the purpose of individual existence and its fulfilment. Most people suppress their desires through fear; but this is not control, it is death. True control is suppleness, activity, the body being fully active but under restraint.

Then there must be control over the emotions, which are but a subtler form of enjoyment. Through emotion, again, desire is seeking happiness. I use the word *control* as self-imposed discipline with understanding—not the stupid control which leaves you bitter, hard, cruel, ruthless. Self-imposed discipline is full of kindness, thoughtfulness, is tender and not harsh. If you are lost in your emotions, in fancy, in romanticism, in mystery, again there is delusion and a craving, an effort towards becoming. Likewise there must be mental control. The function of intellect is to bridge the gulf between action and intuition. It should guide, not dominate, and so bring about perfect harmony.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Tuesday, 22 July, Summer Gathering.

Intellect should act as a bridge between that intuition which is the goal of thought and feeling, and the world of action. As soon as intellect has built a bridge, the function of intellect ceases. Words should also serve as a bridge for understanding. I am using ordinary words with a very definite intention, giving to them a new meaning.

Question: You have said that each of us ought to restrict himself to an absolute minimum of possessions. This seems to me to be in conflict with all that I understand of your teaching. To put possessions on a quantitative basis like this, can only lead to a poverty complex and to interpreting a spiritual virtue in quantitative terms. The story of the Sannyasi who clung to his loin cloth, that is to the minimum, more than the King did to his palace, namely the maximum, surely proves that quantity has nothing to do with the matter.

KRISHNAMURTI: It is not a question of quantity or of whether there is a maximum or a minimum. First, there should be detachment, and then whether you have possessions or not is of very little importance; whether you have a minimum or a maximum does not matter. The question is whether you are attached or not. In explaining anything, I always try to contradict what I have asserted. The story of the King and the Sannyasi shows that it is not a question of minimum or maximum, but of the recognition that your happiness, your clarity of thought and feeling, do not depend on possessions. In a word you should be detached. When once you understand the right value, the true worth of things, you are automatically detached from all things. Therefore you have to find out if you are detached or if you are dependent on material possessions. You can have a multitude of possessions and be detached entirely, or have two loin-

cloths and be attached to them. If you are attached to things, you must learn to discard them.

Question: I feel that the way in which you have explained the value of conduct in the realm of emotion is in danger of creating the same kind of misunderstanding as the one referred to in the last question about possessions, namely that it represents love as growing by a kind of quantitative process. You tell us to begin by loving one person and then to expand that love to several persons, and so on, until it embraces the whole world. This quantitative formula seems to me to be fatal. Neither multiplication nor division leads to the eternal.

KRISHNAMURTI: The world of being, the world of reality, the truth which is the Self, is the consummation of all love. Love includes all the divisions of its opposites—hatred, jealousy, envy, greed for possessions, and so on. To that totality I give the name Love. That Self, that truth, is everything. When once you have understood that, you will not translate love as moral conduct. When you love a person, in that love is included jealousy, selfish possession, the anxious care with which you guard that love. When you transcend that, you are capable of loving everyone, irrespective of the object. Thus it is not a quantitative process.

With real love you can go vertically to the Ultimate; you need not go horizontally through the quantitative process. That is why we must first understand what this totality of life is, what the Self is, what is real, and what is the nature of pure being and pure love. Life is the consummation of all things, of all opposites; it has no attributes, no special relations; it is self-caused, self-existent. You cannot attribute moral or immoral conduct to it, or say it is all love, or all hate. It is everything; it is the subject and the object alike. When once you have understood that, love has a different meaning, in which are included all its opposites.

If you love with your mind and not with your heart, you intellectualise love, you try to find out reasons for your loving. That is, you consider whether the person in question is goodlooking, whether

he is rich, has social position, worldly possessions and so on. You are dividing; whereas really to love is to be all-inclusive.

Question: Can one, by achieving union with the universal life, be consciously united with loved ones who are dead?

KRISHNAMURTI: When there is union with life, there is no question of life or death, of the loved one present or the loved one absent—facts which belong to the world of time and space. You are approaching these things, if I may say so, from a personal point of view. You want to find truth because you want to find a loved one who is lost. Surely that is a very curious way of looking at life. This life, the totality of all things, is the summation of all things, of all individual existences. Individual existence knows life and death, but in the totality there is neither life nor death. One cannot look for a particular individual in the totality. If you do so, you are still maintaining divisions and separations.

Question: Tell us, please, more about the quality of love. Is it that compassion which burns the heart and which one feels sometimes towards every human being?

KRISHNAMURTI: Compassion is the blending of sorrow and pleasure, of pain and joy. True compassion contains the opposites, and understands both. If you do not know what it is to hate, you will never know what it is to love—although of course I do not say that you must hate. The idea that compassion is all-consuming love, in which there is neither hate nor envy nor jealousy, is wrong. Compassion is the admixture of all these; it is all-inclusive, and hence the understanding of all things.

"Please tell us more about the quality of love." What do you mean? Do you mean that you do not know how to love, how to feel? How can I describe that which is indescribable? If you do not know how to love, how can I explain it to you? If you have no sense of touch, how can I tell you what it is to touch? There is no such being as a person who does not love, who does not feel. When you are seeking an explanation for love, you want a superhuman, a

supernatural explanation. Of what value is that, when ordinary love can teach you all that is necessary?

Question: Some time ago you used the expression "What you perceive you desire." In what sense do you mean "perceive"? Do you mean that we desire what we think will make us happier, or do you mean "perceive" in some other way?

KRISHNAMURTI: •When you perceive happiness in the form of possessions, your desire craves for possessions. When you are afraid mentally and emotionally, desire in its perception of fear creates an image for protection and for comfort. You think that by having many possessions, social standing and so forth, you will be happy. So you work and exert your energy; all your faculties, all your feelings are concentrated upon this acquisition. Desire is continually working towards that particular end. Whereas, if your perception, your understanding, is of happiness as *being*, then your desire is to realise this pure being, this effortless existence; and you strive towards that. In this way desire becomes its own discipline.

Question: Can you speak further about perfection? Is it a recognition of the true value of things, or the development of our highest qualities? If the latter, does this not involve time?

KRISHNAMURTI: Recognition involves experience. Perfection, to me, is that effortless being which is the pure life of intuition. Intuition, though it is neither thought nor feeling, is the goal of thought, the end of feeling. If you are all the time concentrated, observant, anxious, you do not consider time. But if you are not highly concentrated, constantly observant, recollected, purposeful, then time is involved.

In every moment of time, surely, all time exists. The way in which you live and understand that moment is the way in which you have understood the whole idea of time. To a liberated man there is no time. Time enters when it is a question of expansion of consciousness, not when it is a question of freedom of consciousness.

Freedom is being; expansion is becoming. But being, the discovering of oneself, the life which is all-inclusive, is reached through constant effort—effort which is self-imposed, self-caused. After all, true conduct is self-realised conduct. Morality must be self-imposed, self-realised, self-caused. You are looking for expansion, becoming, the multiplication of “I am” through time, through different phenomena; and in that, time is necessarily involved. Freedom of being, freedom of consciousness, does not involve time or space, because in that there is no multiplication of many “I am’s”. That is realised in a moment, in which all existence is. Thus liberation is not expansion of consciousness, but freedom of consciousness.

Question: How would you distinguish between the emotional or intellectual reaction created in an ordinary man by a sunset, and the creative thoughts and feelings perceived in the sunset by a great artist or a liberated man? What is the nature of the difference between the two modes of experience?

KRISHNAMURTI: In one case there is excitement; in the other there is no excitement. Excitement means reaction, and the liberated man is free of all reactions. His energy is outward-going; reactions are inward-going. Please do not look for sunsets to inspire you. You are only transferring to Nature the inspiration you looked for in a Master. You are trying to *become* something, to imitate something, instead of realising your own self, in which the whole summation of truth lies hidden. It is not in the worship of another “I am” that you find truth. That is only an illusion. In the realisation of one’s being, which is the being of all things, alone is happiness.

Question: Please tell us how to discover the essentials of life.

KRISHNAMURTI: First of all, pure life is all-inclusive; it contains the essential and the non-essential. Realising individual existence and the purpose of that individual existence, you discover the essential, that is the Self. You cannot give to that totality any quality of essential or unessential; but by going through the process of

discrimination, you must find out by your own experience that which is lasting.

Question: Please explain the nature of action.

KRISHNAMURTI: Action, to me, is creation, life in creation. Do not look at creation as manifestation or non-manifestation. Life is not concerned about manifestation or non-manifestation. Life is creation, being, and may result in manifestation, or not. Therefore life is action in creation—creation being both the object and the subject. In itself it is objectless and subjectless. Being is the true creation—not the making of a flower, or a stone, or even an individuality. Action is the totality of all creation.

Thursday, 24 July

There is so much suffering involved in action that man turns to truth in his desire for comfort. So truth becomes a matter of convenience, a refuge, a source of comfort. But truth has no quality, being impersonal. When you attribute a quality to it, you are detracting from the totality of truth, because of your one-sided comprehension of life's struggle. You must look for truth beyond personal, self-conscious, individual desires. If you seek comfort, you establish in that desire for comfort stages of varying consolation. But truth is beyond all limitation, beyond the time and space in which individual consciousness exists. If you approach truth with that limitation of self-consciousness, you will not understand enduring conscious happiness.

I will explain the difference between self-consciousness and consciousness. Self-consciousness is the outcome of individual existence in which there is separateness, in which there is conflict, one against another; whereas consciousness is that selfhood in which all individual consciousnesses exist, which is beyond time and space, although time and space are in that consciousness. That enduring, conscious happiness is positive being. Individual self-consciousness knows decay, perishes, comes into existence and dies; whereas that enduring con-

sciousness knows no decay. It is continuous. To that changeless thing you cannot—through your moods, through births and deaths, through this variety of change—attribute individual self-consciousness. You must look at it absolutely impersonally, and that impersonal care assures the incorruptibility of self-discipline.

Question: To all of us, at present, love means love for another individual. The idea of death is agony because it means separation from the individual or individuals we love. So we turn to religion, or theosophy, or spiritualism, and find comfort in their various theories, which enable us to hope that we shall again be united to those we love. I gather that, from your point of view, not only is this hope, this longing for comfort, a delusion; but the desire to prolong individuality in ourselves or others is but to invite sorrow, because it is to continue in limitation. Whereas if we can realise pure being, we experience in its totality that joy which we have known in an infinitesimal degree through individual love. Is this your meaning?

KRISHNAMURTI: The sorrow caused by death is but another way of being aware that you, as an individual, are a separate being; hence, there is loneliness. That loneliness is caused because you give your love to another being who is aware of his individuality, and so, when that person dies—as he must—there is sorrow. But if you are aware—through effort, through purity of conduct in which there is no sense of separation—your love (in which is included hate, jealousy, envy, greed: all the opposites), instead of being attached to individual existences, becomes its own continuity, its own eternity. Because in your consciousness there is separateness, the cognisance of individuality, of “you” and “I”, there must be sorrow. When you are aware of separation, there is limitation, and in its wake there is suffering. If you love but the external, which is the manifestation of the real, there must be suffering; whereas if you love the reality in all things, though the expressions may vary, there is the continuity of love. Each one who is in sorrow is looking for an explanation of sorrow, an explanation which shall dissipate the sorrow caused by separation. If someone dies, you want to be united with that in-

dividual on another plane of consciousness, on another plane of phenomena. You should look at it from the point of view of the continuity of existence. You look at love—in which is involved hate, greed, and all the opposites—from the point of view of self-conscious individuality, and you want that individuality to be prolonged through time; that is, you want that individuality to be continually expanding. If you know that individuality is a limitation, that the purpose of individual existence is to realise the unity of life, to realise pure existence without effort, then through struggle you realise that in that unity all separate individuals are united. Then you no longer ask to be united with that which you love as a separate entity.

Question: In reply to the question “Why are we here?”, you stated at Ojai that man grows from unconscious perfection, through conscious imperfection, to conscious perfection. Can you explain the need for this? Why is perfection unconscious in the beginning?

KRISHNAMURTI: “Can you explain the need for this?” I cannot. There it is. You can have a theory, I can give you a theory; but of what value are theories? When I use the words “unconscious perfection”, I mean that Nature hides life, and that Nature fulfils itself in individual consciousness which is aware of separateness, which is conscious imperfection, effort, struggle, birth and death, sorrow, pain, pleasure, the variety of moods, the change of pleasures. Individual consciousness fulfils itself in conscious being, which is pure happiness. Now you want to know why perfection is unconscious in the beginning? In Nature there is unconscious perfection because Nature is instinctive, whereas the purpose of man is to transform that instinct into reason through effort.

Question: Why do you say “Life is creation” instead of “Life is creative”? Is not creation the thing formed, and is not life the principle of that formation?

KRISHNAMURTI: To me, life is both the creator and the created, both the subject and the object, both the unmanifested and the mani-

fested. From the point of view of the totality of life there is neither object nor subject. That in which all individuality, all separateness exists, cannot be aware of object and subject. It is everything. It is not aware of the thing created apart from itself. The man who is separate knows the subject and the object; but that which is both object and subject cannot be aware of either object or subject.

Question: I understand you to say that the man who has attained is perpetually acting from the poise of reason and love, which is effortless being. This is pure action. Those individuals who have not attained react to this outpouring, each according to his degree of understanding. Does not this reaction determine the conditions and circumstances of the illumined one's embodied life? Indeed, does it not determine his very embodiment? If pure action induced no reaction, would physical existence cease? Is not physical existence based on action and reaction? In other words, is the physical personality of the man who is liberated perceptible only to him who is reacting; whereas, when this one also acts purely, will not both of these two, having discovered the "I" in whom is no separation, duality or limitation, have transcended the physical? At this point what would the unilluminated individual perceive? Would he be aware of two separate embodiments, each of whom had attained, and to whose pure action he reacts? If these two were perceptible to the reacting consciousness as two, how would they appear to each other?

KRISHNAMURTI: This question, in which there are so many questions, is put from the point of view of reaction. Now I am talking of action as outward-going, which, to me, is pure action; whereas reaction is turned inwards. Now this pure action is the outcome of the perfect balance of reason and love; and this harmony leads to intuition, the end of thought and the goal of feeling. So the man who acts purely, acts always from that poise, irrespective of circumstances, environment, special relations. But reaction depends on these and is inward-turned. There is no sense of separateness in pure action.

Question: Does life, for the realisation of which the individual is struggling, appear differently to different temperaments?

KRISHNAMURTI: Certainly not. Temperaments exist because of separate individual existences; but that which knows no separation cannot be translated into temperaments; you cannot approach it through a particular temperament. If you look at it from the point of view of the part, you do not see the whole, and naturally the whole appears in terms of the part, and so you translate that part as temperament. Through a temperament you cannot perceive that which is beyond all temperaments. As a person realises this life, he may translate it differently, using different terms, a different language, but it will be the same picture. It is like two artists who paint the same scene. If you try to find unity in those two pictures on the canvas, you will be utterly confused; but if you perceive the scene itself, you will find there the unity that has been translated into two different expressions. Now expressions are temperaments, and in temperaments there cannot be unity; but there is unity in that which creates temperaments.

Question: Would you kindly speak further to us concerning the distinction between individual temperament and what you have called individual uniqueness?

KRISHNAMURTI: Individual temperament varies, whereas individual uniqueness is continuous until it achieves, until it has realised. Individual temperament depends on birth, involving change of environment, personality, race consciousness, heredity, and so on. Individual uniqueness is continuous through birth and death, is the sole guide in your existence as a separate individual, until you reach the goal.

Question: In what manner can I best test myself to find out whether I really want that truth of which you speak, or whether I am only superficially interested?

KRISHNAMURTI: That you can only find out by putting into

practice the little you may have understood of that reality of which I speak. In putting your understanding into practice, you will soon find out how much desire you have to conquer the whole. In olden days those who desired to find truth relinquished the whole world, withdrew to a monastic or an ascetic life. Now, the effort must come where you are, within yourself, surrounded by all manner of confusions, contradictory ideas, by what you would call temptations. (From my point of view there is no such thing as "temptation.") If I formed an exclusive body of ascetics, perhaps you would all join it—or rather, probably you would not, because it would demand too much energy on your part, too much discomfort—but that would be merely a superficial acknowledgment of what you want to realise.

Throwing off one cloth and adopting another cloth is not going to strengthen you in your desire. What strengthens you is desire itself. In watching, in guiding that desire, in being all the time self-recollected in your conduct, in your thought, in your movements, in your behaviour, all the time adjusting yourself to that which you realise as the purpose of individual existence—by this alone you will find the positive test, not by belonging to sects, societies, groups and orders. Then you utilise experience; you do not become a slave to experience. Therefore pure conduct demands purity of thought. By "purity" I mean the purity brought about through reason, not through the sentimentality of belief. Reason is the essence of your experience—or of the experience of another which you have examined impersonally, without the desire for comfort or authority—which you have analysed and criticised impersonally. That is the only test, and that is the only value in life—not innumerable theories.

In listening to what I have said about pure action, realisation, pure being, do not get lost in abstractions and metaphysics and forget ordinary conduct, the way to live, the way to *be*. You may have theories about this pure being or happiness, or whatever you like to call it; but if you are jealous, envious, greedy for possessions, cruel, thoughtless, inconsiderate, of what value are your theories?

To arrive at the reality you must be rid of these things, and to be rid of them you must have an understanding vision of that reality, and put that into practice; otherwise you are caught in mere expressions.

Question: My desire is to be always with you. I have consciously suppressed it and unconsciously repressed it. How may I learn to control it?

KRISHNAMURTI: I think this ought to be put into poetry! Control what? The desire to be with someone? When you make your love personal, there is sorrow, there is pain, struggle, limitation imposed on that eternity which is Love itself. While you are separate, and know that separation, sorrow awaits you. This thing which embodies me, the "I", dies, and if you rely on that, there is sorrow. But if you realise the life itself, which is embodied in everything, in every human being, and love that life, then the change of forms, the change of manifestations, of expressions, will not entangle you in their sorrow.

Question: You say that "in a moment all time exists" and "to the liberated man there is no time". Does the last statement, taken in conjunction with the first, imply that it is possible to bridge lack of experience by intuitive realisation, vicariously? And how, since we are also told that "true value requires experience"?

KRISHNAMURTI: I said that for the liberated man there is no time; but to the man of sorrow there is time. You look to the future for this realisation—the idea that you will achieve some day, and that some day is postponed indefinitely because of the dull laziness of slow energy. You postpone the realisation because there is not that intense desire. But if you have the intense desire, you have no wish to postpone. With that intense desire you live every experience that you come across and assimilate it, and so you are freeing yourself from each experience. To live in that moment in which is all eternity (every moment is all eternity), there must be this high con-

centration, this realisation of inward being, at which you arrive through ceaseless resistance. Then there is that effortless being—not in the sense of a sleepy, static condition. You are. You are the whole. Then, to you, every moment is eternity, because you never step out of that moment. You are not concerned with the future or with the past, because in that moment all time exists. Try for once to live with that concentration which demands impersonal being, the riddance of individual self-conscious effort at being good. That effort is possible for every one, if only there is the impelling desire behind it. Therefore look not to disciplines, look not to external guides to force you to this concentration; but examine every experience, every thought. Desire in its anxious, impelling, forward movement in search of happiness, will establish in you that discipline of concentration which is pure conduct.

Question: If I control myself with what I believe to be self-imposed discipline, with understanding, and yet find that the result is bitterness, thoughtlessness, and harshness, where does the cause lie? Is it in defective understanding?

KRISHNAMURTI: By "understanding" I mean the understanding of the purpose of individual existence, which is not to know separateness. So long as you are aware of separateness, there is bitterness, thoughtlessness, carelessness, cruelty, greed, jealousy and envy. But if you understand the purpose of this self-conscious individual existence, which is to realise the unity of life, then that understanding, when there is discipline, shall not give rise to bitterness, thoughtlessness or harshness. You impose discipline on yourself because of sorrow; and then, because it does not result in achievement or realisation, there is bitterness. But, if your perception is all-inclusive and knows no separation, you will not be bitter.

SPIRITUAL REALISATION

A TALK BY KRISHNAMURTI

Friday, 25 July, Summer Gathering.

For years past you have come to the Camp and to these pre-Camp Gatherings with many confused ideas. From all parts of the world a large body of people has gathered round a certain person. That large body, which was organised, has been dissolved. Since they were attracted to a personality rather than to the central reality, out of that large body more and more will naturally fall away, and there will be fewer and fewer who will concentrate, who will give their full attention to it. I am not holding this out as a threat. It is natural that this should be so. There can only be a concentrated few who are willing to give their entire lives, their enthusiasm, their interest, to this one thing which they recognise as the central, dynamic force in life.

This reality is not come at by reason, but by experience. When it is approached along the road of experience, there is constant adjustment, a constant focussing of thought, of emotion, a constant sifting of the unessential. Now, so far as I myself am concerned, I have realised this, but it is very difficult to describe that which is only realisable. It is subtle, naturally, because it is the whole of life. We can discuss it, we can dissect it, we can tear it to pieces; but that central reality, which to me is absolute and unlimited, can only be approached with the desire to understand with affection. But you should approach it with a detachment from the person who is speaking, and from your own delusions.

Now, whenever there is a fight against ignorance, which is the admixture of the essential and the non-essential, and whenever there is a fight against the limitation of emotion, of thought and reason, there comes, through that struggle, the discovery of individuality—the sense of awakened separateness which does not exist in unconscious Nature, but only in the man who is aware of his struggle against ignorance, against limitation. Hence in man there is this

duality of "you" and "I". When you, as an individual who knows separation, have conquered this separation, all delusion ceases. In this conflict of the awakened individuality which knows separateness, in this struggle, in this fight, there must be delusion, because delusion is created out of the desire for comfort.

The desire for comfort is the outcome of fear. When you are afraid, you are seeking shelter from the conflict of life, and you seek to mould your conduct—and so, yourself—after a standard, a pattern, a system. Another delusion is the craving for the continuity of one's individuality and the innumerable questions which arise from that craving—will one be united after death with one's loved ones; what happens to one when one dies; does one continue to exist, and will one return in another body; and, if so, in what manner? These are all but cravings for the continuity of one's individuality in time. Whenever there is delusion, there is a seeking of comfort, a seeking for the persistency of individual existence.

One must realise that this clinging of desire to persons, to the development of one's own personality, to the continuance of the "I", is a delusion; and when one has done this, in its place there is born faith. By faith I do not mean faith in another person, however highly evolved, however superior, but faith in the reality which exists within oneself. That is what I call true faith, the realisation that within you lies the potentiality of the whole, and that your task is to grasp and to be that reality. When you possess such faith, then there is the certainty of individual purpose, the concentrated longing to be united with the totality in which there is no separation, no distinction of "object" and "subject". From that comes recollectedness, the constant awareness which is concentration upon all that you are doing. Later on, this recollectedness will become spontaneous; for it is your own desire that is constantly urging you to purify your conduct more and more and, to this end, to purify your emotions and your thought. It is your own desire arising from a clear understanding of the purpose of individual existence.

The conduct that is born out of purity of emotion and thought

and from intuitive understanding will not entangle, will not act as a cage, but as an instrument of realisation. Conduct is the way of life, the way to that supreme, serene reality, which everyone—in whom life is potential, though held in bondage—must realise. For that, there need not be discussions on metaphysics.

Wherever there is sorrow, such sorrow is the outcome of the struggle to distinguish between the essential and the non-essential. One is aware of happiness, pain and pleasure; and in adjusting oneself to this continual variety of change lies sorrow. So there arises a desire to fight sorrow, to escape sorrow and to treat sorrow as a terrible thing; whereas sorrow and pleasure alike are the soil in which to grow, in which you can diminish this sense of separateness—which is true growth.

In each one there must be born this faith of certainty. It is not brought about through reason, but by the continual groping through experience, urged on by desire in its search for the ultimate reality. As I have so often said, spiritual realisation is for all, because that reality exists within each one. Nevertheless, it is only the few who can concentrate, who can all the time be aware, adjusting themselves with continual watchfulness and with unwearied choice of the essential, and who thus come to realise more and more that effortless existence, that effortless being, which is serene, which is supreme.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Friday 25 July (cont.)

Question: I have been and am a victim of lack of interest and enthusiasm in life. I have watched myself and those around me and felt that I knew the reason, and that it lay within myself. Three years ago I first heard from you the vital truth that the way of liberation and of true and lasting happiness lies through the proper understanding of the nature of true love, not in the abstract, but in actual life; that bondage exists no longer for the person whose love is able to transcend the particular, whose affection is not confined to a single individual and yet has lost nothing of its intensity and quality by becoming impersonal. At that time I had no more than an intellectual conception of this great truth, though a clear one. During the interval of years, due to the process of repeatedly dwelling on it and through suffering and continual effort, I have succeeded in wearing out—at any rate, considerably—this particular scar of the self, and I am now able to get a deeper insight into truth. I feel that a great barrier has been removed, a self-imposed barrier that I had regarded as a possible cause of my condition, having likewise noticed it in others. However I find myself still lacking enthusiasm, and unable to get myself keenly interested in life around me. I still belong to the blasé type of individual. I feel that no one can draw me out of this slough except myself. As one who has attained and who has in himself reached the fulfilment of life, you can, perhaps, indicate possible causes of this particular condition which seems to me a typical rather than a unique one.

KRISHNAMURTI: In this case there is that lack of interest which comes only through the negative way of seeking happiness. I will explain. Interest is the only cause of sustained enthusiasm—the interest, I mean, which is deep-rooted, not the interest in fleeting things. If interest lies in fleeting things, enthusiasm is dissipated.

But if interest for this faith, for this certainty, for this recollectedness is established through suffering, through continual reasoning, through sifting, through choice and discernment, then out of that interest enthusiasm is maintained and sustained. Therefore one has to find out where one's interest lies, not where one's enthusiasm is. Enthusiasm is but the outcome of interest. I am interested in life, so I am all the time watching, watching—please do not misunderstand—watching how to put what I have realised into words, how to describe it on a canvas, how to make it clear to the minds of others, so that they will discuss and reason. But if I were not interested, then I should lose my enthusiasm and withdraw from the conflict.

Love is not qualitative nor quantitative. By loving the one in many, one should come to love the many in one. But that requires great suffering, great understanding, great discernment and watchfulness. First of all, there is the reaction of love; you love someone whom you like and who likes you, which is but bargaining. Out of that comes sorrow, uncertainty and indifference. Such love is not positive, whereas the love which is pure action is positive. Your love goes through the process of reaction and indifference, until it becomes pure action. The man who loves the particular, if he is aware that he is a prisoner to that one particularity, and hence in bondage, must go through sorrow, through the ebb and flow of happiness and unhappiness, until he comes to that state of indifference which is described in this question. Indifference is incapability of reaction as well as incapability of pure action; it is but a negative state of being. Because it is negation, there is still sorrow, pain and pleasure; and he is still seeking for that pure action which is positive being. It is the way of life that, in transcending reaction, one first comes to this indifference and, through it, to positive being. Happy is the man who realises that he is in a state of indifference or in a state of reaction, because then he is still seeking, and in that seeking lies his liberation—not in being satisfied, contented.

Question: It seems obvious, from what you say, that in order

to be free from the limitations of individuality, one must have the desire for liberation. The vast majority of people have no such desire. Indeed they are still engaged in the process of becoming more and more self-conscious and separate. They will die as they are. Either they will reincarnate to continue the struggle until, through sorrow, they change their desires—in which case we are back to reincarnation, an unproved theory to most people, as you have stated yourself—or they will be re-absorbed into the totality as an automatic unconscious process. If this is what happens in any case, there is no point in struggle. While recognising that the ordinary course of evolution in time may be transcended by intense desire to reach the goal, one must ask: What about the majority who have no such desire?

KRISHNAMURTI: The question is: Must the majority suffer and reincarnate, or be absorbed? The majority is held between the "you" and "I" of separate existences. This majority is conditioned by circumstances, by the "you" and "I" of separate being, by environment, by social conditions, by politics, and so on. But when you realise that you, as a person who knows separateness, in whom there is "you" and "I", are dissipating and wearing down the sense of separateness, then you are establishing a new condition, and the majority disappears. This is not merely a theory; please think it over and you will see what I mean. The few create a different environment by their efforts, by their concentration, and hence create a new world, a new order of things.

It is not a question of the majority; it is a question of you—you who are sitting before me—whether you are making this concentrated effort in faith, or waiting for the rhythm of time to urge you on towards that realisation. The average is you; the majority is you. Because you know—as "you" and "I"—the sense of separateness, you create through this sense of separateness a world of cruelty, greed, possessions: a multiplication of horrors born out of this egoism of separateness. Do not look to the alteration of the majority by someone, but look to the alteration of the majority in yourself.

Question: Many of us who have gathered here to concentrate all our efforts, take part in games, dancing and smoking. Do you think these unnecessarily dissipate our energies and prevent concentration?

KRISHNAMURTI: That depends on the individual. Most people in the world suppress their desires without understanding and through fear, because they think that the spirituality which they seek lies in suppression. They grow in age through suppression and hence come back to the same state in which they were when they were twenty, which is but a waste of time. If you are your age at all times, then there is no necessity for dissipating concentration. There is a slogan, I believe, in America: "Be your age"—which is very applicable at the present time. It is no good behaving, when one is fifty, like a boy of twenty. I am not going to lay down a law whether you should or should not dance, smoke, or play games. The question is, what value you give to these things; and that depends on how much you are a slave to them. To find out how much you depend on them, to test that dependence, you should give them up—I am not saying that you *must* give them up, but that you must test yourself and find out where your real interest lies.

I am not objecting to games, to smoking, to dancing, or to any other form of amusement. But the question you should ask yourself is: Why am I here? Do not, please, make all this artificial, or it will have no value. If it is your desire to amuse yourself, then dance, play games, play bridge, or do anything else which will amuse you; but if you want something else, then do that something with concentration.

Question: You often speak of the aim of life as being happiness. I find that, as I grow in life, happiness and unhappiness begin to mean less and less. Their place is taken by certainty, reality, compared to which happiness and unhappiness are as the rise and fall of waves to the ocean. That reality is my aim, whether it makes me happy or unhappy. In fact, I believe that, as one reaches it, one is beyond either happiness or unhappiness. So why speak of happiness as the aim of life? This is not just a question of terms.

KRISHNAMURTI: Life, as such, has no purpose, no aim; but individual existence has a purpose, which is to realise this being in which there is no "you" and "I", in which there is no separation of subject and object, in which there is absolute unity of being. Now you can call that intuition, happiness or liberation. I use the word happiness because, when there is the state of equal happiness and unhappiness, it is merely negative, whereas this state of bliss is positive. One has, unfortunately, to use words to convey the meaning of something which cannot be described in its totality, however much one may try to do so.

How can you describe to a blind man the beauty of sunrise or sunset? You may attempt it. You may say: It is warmth, it is light, it is this or that; but the real beauty, to be fully realised, must be seen. Words, therefore, can only be a bridge. I use ordinary words with a very definite intention, giving to them a new meaning. To me, this state of equal happiness and unhappiness, which is analogous to the rise and ebb of the sea, is but a state of negation, a negative condition. Whereas the positive state is Being—that bliss which is the essence of all happiness and unhappiness—which you need not call "happiness" if you do not wish to do so. It is liberation from all limitation of emotion, of reason; and yet it is the goal of all reason and all emotion and all thought. To me, this happiness is a condition in which all states of happiness exist, and it is not dependent on changes of pleasure and pain. To realise this highest reality you go through doubt, faith, certainty, recollectedness, in which is involved happiness and unhappiness, sorrow, pain, joy, envy, greed—all these, however, being but the steps of a ladder. When once you have reached the highest step, you are no longer dependent on the lower steps. The highest is the positive, to which you can give any name you like. That is why I am quite willing to yield to a different name. The name does not matter; what matters is that it is positive. This supreme positiveness is the essence of positive and negative, it is the quintessence of all things in their variety of expressions, in their changes, in their moods; and therefore it is Life itself.

Question: In every condition in life in this incarnation, whether as a single woman, as a wife and mother, or as a widow, I have always had to be the pillar which has supported the family building. I have never been short of anything except time, but I have always been alone in ideas. Now, at seventy years of age, I am determined to take advantage of the privilege of liberation that you offer to humanity, and I ask you: May I obtain liberation now, as I am, in order to help humanity as I have always endeavoured to do, but with greater certainty and effectiveness?

KRISHNAMURTI: If I may say so, without creating confusion or misunderstanding, it is not a question of helping the world. You will do that automatically, spontaneously, as every beautiful thing does. Beauty is unconscious, virtue is unconscious; it is only vice that is conscious, because vice is effort, battling against things, adjustment. So the question is not this, but "Can I, at my age, attain and realise?" Here again, it is not a question of age. Life has no age limit. The body wears out as a coat wears out, so the question is: Can I at any time, whether old or young, achieve? Surely, anyone can do so, if he is willing to concentrate, to have this intense faith. Do not misunderstand what I mean by faith—I do not mean faith in something external, but the realisation that within oneself lies the totality, the potentiality and the certainty. With that, anyone can achieve. It is not reserved for the few. But that desire, that intensity, depends on your effort, on your interest—and of that, you alone can judge. So it is not a question of age or environment.

Question: When one has realised that state of mind and heart where a certain detachment, calm and strength is established, why does the illusion of loneliness persist? Even the inward perception of beauty does not stifle that feeling of loneliness. Why is so much effort needed to overcome it?

KRISHNAMURTI: Loneliness is the outcome of the sense of separateness, and that is the most difficult thing to remove. When you

have removed it, there is no longer a sense of loneliness, of "you" and "I" as separate beings. There must be different, multifarious expressions of life, but life is essentially one. For the man who has realised the unity of all things, there is no sorrow of loneliness.

Question: What is the real place of loneliness in the eternal reality in life?

KRISHNAMURTI: It has no place in reality. It occupies the same place in experience as the desire to be with many people, or to be with a loved one. They are both soils in which to establish individuality, the sense of separateness. To wear down that individuality, to discover the essential amidst the unessential, all kinds of soil are needed—love, hate, jealousy, greed, action, inaction, loneliness, the desire for company: all these are required. The man who depends on any one of these, knows separation and is in the bondage of unhappiness, limitation, sorrow and pain.

Question: Loneliness, for me, is not merely that feeling of separateness and seclusion. It is something universal. Every being is suffering from loneliness to a certain extent; it exists in humanity and thus is not my personal disease. How can I conquer it?

KRISHNAMURTI: Every human being knows the sense of separateness; therefore it is universal, in the sense that it exists in the heart and mind of every human being. But to the man who has stepped out of this ocean of sorrow, of separateness, there is no loneliness; although, seen from the ocean of sorrow, that man may appear to be lonely.

Question: What is your view on modesty?

KRISHNAMURTI: Modesty is humility, respectfulness for another, in the true sense of effacing oneself. It is the effacement of oneself in the sense of not knowing "you" and "I"—humility with substance, not humility with hypocrisy. Humility is the essence of modesty, which is, after all, not to know that you as an individual exist as a separate being. So you respect everything and do not

place yourself as an individual before others. Everyone is subject to flattery, so long as this sorrow of separation exists. But flattery and insult are the same thing to the man who knows no division. Humility is arrived at by constantly watching your actions, in your games, in your eating, in your dancing, in everything. Such a man is then serene, stable, supreme, unaffected by flattery or insult, by possessions or poverty. He is beyond all the clutches of limitation.

Question: Do you know other persons after Jesus who became liberated, from your point of view? This is not because I want to follow, but because I wish to study their lives and actions in the world of manifestation. Is liberation something so difficult to achieve that, in the history of the world, we find so very few people liberated?

KRISHNAMURTI: Liberation is not difficult to achieve. Concentration, sustained effort, is difficult to maintain—and hence the few. It is not difficult to arrive at that which is in all things, or difficult to realise it; but there are many things between you and that realisation which, through continual effort, choice and discernment, you must eschew and put aside. That requires intense faith, recollectedness, concentration and continual energy. Very few are willing to make that effort and hence the few who attain, who realise. You again approach the question from the point of view of separateness, as if it were something for the few alone. How can it be for the few, when that reality is in all things, in everyone?

ITINERARY OF EUROPEAN TOUR

During the latter half of 1930 and the first five months of 1931 Krishnamurti will make his first lecture tour throughout Europe. Accompanied by Mr. D. Rajagopal, he intends to visit every European country with the exception of Spain, Portugal, Bulgaria and Soviet Russia. The following is the proposed itinerary, which however is subject to alteration.

1930

October 15 to November 6	FRANCE SWITZERLAND
November 6 to 30	ITALY
December 9 to 14	GREECE
December 17 to 23	ROUMANIA

1931

January 5 to 8	JUGOSLAVIA
January 10 to 16	HUNGARY
January 18 to 24	AUSTRIA
January 26 to 30	CZECHOSLOVAKIA
February 1 to 28	HOLLAND
March 1 to 30	ENGLAND & WALES
	SCOTLAND
March 30 to April 1	IRELAND
April 2 to 23	BELGIUM
April 24 to 29	GERMANY
April 29 to May 1	POLAND
May 2 to 3	GERMANY
May 4 to 6	LATVIA
May 7 to 11	ESTHONIA
May 12 to 19	FINLAND
May 20 to 26	SWEDEN
May 27 to 30	NORWAY
	DENMARK

AMERICAN TOUR

OF YADUNANDAN PRASAD

It has been arranged that Mr. Prasad should spend the year 1931 in America to bring Krishnamurti's line of thought to the country, visiting not only the large centres but, as far as possible, covering the entire country.

Mr. Prasad will not only give public lectures but will also accept invitations to address small groups and educational institutions. Those wishing to arrange for Mr. Prasad to address small groups, or to give public lectures in their locality, are requested to communicate with —
ERNEST B. OSBORNE, c/o KINMIR AGENCY, 100 E. 42ND ST., NEW YORK CITY, U. S. A.

Those located in the states of Washington, Oregon, California, Arizona, Nevada, Utah or Idaho, should communicate with —
LOUIS ZALK, c/o OJAI STAR INSTITUTE, 2123 BEACHWOOD DRIVE, HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.

SPECIAL BINDERS FOR THE 1930 VOLUME of the INTERNATIONAL STAR BULLETIN

Yellow cover, with black backing stamped with gold letters. Copies are held firmly in position, and may be inserted or withdrawn at will. A few still unsold. Order yours to-day and save the cost of special binding. When ordering direct from Holland, prices are as follows, post free:

f 2.20 or £ 0-3-9 or \$ 1.00

The above prices are exclusive of customs charges. Prices set by our Agents in the different countries may be higher to cover import duties.

International Star Bulletin - Eerde - Ommen - Holland

THE STAR PUBLISHING TRUST

E E R D E - O M M E N - H O L L A N D

LIST OF AGENTS

ARGENTINA:	Señor José Carbone, Avenida de Mayo 1411, Buenos Aires
AUSTRALIA:	Mr. John Mackay, 13 Burrawong Avenue, Mosman, N.S.W.
AUSTRIA:	Dr. Richard Weiss, Schelleingasse 9, vii-6, Vienna IV
BELGIUM:	Mme. Juliette Hou, 84, Ave. de Floréal, Brussels-Uccle
BRAZIL:	Sr. A. de Souza, Rua Santa Alexandrina 221, Rio de Janeiro
CHILE:	Sr. Armando Hamel, Casilla 3603, Santiago
COSTA RICA:	Mrs. Edith Field Povedano, Apartado 206, San José
CUBA:	Dr. Damaso Pasalodos, Apartado 2474, Havana
CZECHOSLOVAKIA:	Mr. Joseph Skuta, Ostrava-Kuncicky 290
DENMARK:	Mr. Marius Andersen, Aaboulevard 22, Copenhagen N
DUTCH E. INDIES:	Mr. Herre van der Veen, Post Box 7, Bandoeng, Java
ENGLAND, WALES, AND IRELAND:	Mrs. Gertrude Roberts, 6, Tavistock Square, London W.C.1
FINLAND:	Miss Helmi Jalovaara, Vuorikatu 5-B, Helsingfors
GERMANY:	Mr. James Vigeveno, Viktoriastr. 7, Berlin-Neubabelsberg
HOLLAND:	Mr. M. Ch. Bouwman, Alkmaarsche Straat 1, Scheveningen
HUNGARY:	Mrs. Ella von Hild, 9 Ferenc Korut 5-2-II, Budapest
ICELAND:	Mrs. A. Sigurdardottir Nielsson, Laugarnesi, Reykjavik
INDIA:	Star Office, Adyar, Madras
ITALY:	Grant A. Greenham, Esq., Post Office Box 155, Trieste
LATVIA:	Miss Vera Meyer-Klimenko, Lacplesa'ila 23 dz. 6, Riga
MEXICO:	Sr. A. de la Pena Gil, P. O. Box 8014, Mexico City
NEW ZEALAND:	Miss E. Hunt, 171 Idris Road, Papanui, Christchurch
NORWAY:	Dr. Lilly Heber, Box 34, Blommenholm
POLAND:	Countess Helen Potulicka, Moniuszki 4/7, Warsaw
PORTO RICO:	Sr. Enrique Biascochea, Box 1334, San Juan
PORTUGAL:	Col. O. Garcao, Vila Mathias 54-1º, Alges, Lisbon
ROUMANIA:	Mrs. Stefania Rusu, Piata Lahovary No. 1, Bucharest I
SCOTLAND:	Mrs. Jean Bindley, 12, Albert Terrace, Edinburgh
SPAIN:	Sr. Francisco Rovira, Apartado No. 867, Madrid
SWEDEN:	Miss Noomi Hagge, Miss Elsa Pehrson, Norrlandsgatan 30, Stockholm
UNITED STATES:	Mr. E. B. Osborne, 100 E. 42nd St., New York City
URUGUAY:	Sr. Adolfo Castells, Agraciada 2469, Montevideo